

Identity

Magazine of the British National Party

December 2005 - Issue 61 - £1.95

BLAIR'S BRITAIN

Always WINTER
Never CHRISTMAS

»» A Present to
the Crescent?
P 10



»» Why Britain's Trade
Defecit Matters
P 14





December's News

» No Jobs For Our Student Nurses

In recent months it has been reported that newly qualified British-born doctors have been unable to find NHS appointments. Now, the *Nursing Standard* magazine states that nurses who have just qualified are finding it difficult to get jobs in the NHS and are taking any jobs, including in supermarkets and pubs, in order to make ends meet.

Particular hot spots where the new nurses are having trouble getting a NHS job include Birmingham, Coventry, Sheffield, Surrey and Durham, as well as Scotland and Wales.

Yet nurses and doctors are still being imported from Third World countries, where they are more urgently needed than in the UK. We can only assume that this is to hold down NHS salaries.

» The Unacceptable Face of Bureaucracy

One of the two Department of Trade and Industry inspectors investigating the collapse of MG Rover has charged nearly £12,000 a day for three months work. According to a Business News report in the *Daily Telegraph* of 08.11.05 the inspectors are also understood to be planning to roll out the investigation for another five years. The taxpayer will pick up the multi-million pound bill.

» Racist Violence That Went Unreported

A racist attack by Muslim Asians against a pub in Dudley on November 5th ruined the firework evening for local families. A gang of about 20 Asian youths arrived at The Plough public house on Tiverdale Road and one of their number threw a massive firework into the crowd enjoying the display in the pub grounds. Others threw smaller fireworks and bangers. A number of

the local white men charged at the youths in a bid to protect their families from being hurt.

About ten minutes later as the white families were dispersing, the Asian youths returned with reinforcements including a taxi whose driver then rushed at the white men present with a machete. Only a robust defence and the quick arrival of the police prevented serious injury to any of the locals.

» More Handouts For Asylum Seekers

According to *The Sun*, 11.11.05, asylum seekers are being allowed to keep £1 million in a benefits bungle, while Britons have to pay back the overpaid amounts. Some 4,500 'refugees' each got up to £16,000 a year for two years. They were even sent a letter of apology for initially being asked to repay these amounts!

It was also announced last month that Lotto chiefs have dished out £33 million to asylum seeker groups under Labour. It started at £120,000 to groups helping asylum seekers here in 1997 and soared to nearly £8.5 million last year.

Hundreds of thousands were even given to the National Coalition for Anti-Deportation Campaigns, which was accused by David Blunkett of undermining his token purge on immigration abuses.

» Black Archbishop Attacks Multi-culturalism

It is a year ago since Trevor Phillips, Chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, shocked the liberal 'intelligentsia' by saying that multiculturalism was not working. Last month in an interview in *The Times* the black Archbishop of York, Dr John Sentamu joined in the attack by saying that multiculturalism has denied English people the right to celebrate their history and national identity. Perhaps he has been reading this magazine.

Dr Sentamu (who originally sat as a judge in Uganda before being ordained) also said: "The English are somehow embarrassed about some of the good things they have done. They have done some terrible things but not all the empire was a bad idea." Thanks, we think!

» Amnesty For IRA Murderers

Just two days after Blair's plan to detain suspected terrorists for 90 days was defeated, his Government quietly passed a Bill which would allow up to 150 IRA terrorists to return to Northern Ireland without facing the threat of jail.

One of those likely to be entitled to take advantage of the legislation is Charles Caulfield, who was said to be the man who built and detonated the Enniskillen bomb, which massacred 11 people at a Remembrance Day ceremony in 1987.

» The Cost of Iraq

Dealing with the aftermath of the Iraq war cost Britain £910 million last year, Ministry of Defence accounts revealed last month. The bill sends the total spent in this war, that serves no British interests and has lost us nearly 100 men, to £3.1 billion. This is equivalent to a spend of £2.5 million a day. Nor does it take into account the rising cost of sending our men and women to Afghanistan; again, not in Britain's interests.

Identity

Editor: John Bean
December 2005

Public reference:
ISSN 1469-7971

Subscriptions Dept:

PO Box 87, Ossett,
Wakefield, WF5 8WN
Tel: 0870 75 73 267.

Please note that we receive more material than we can publish. Articles should be submitted to the addresses below in typed/electronic format:
PO Box 97, Newmarket,
Suffolk CB8 1WT.

Email: Identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk.

New Labour's New Stasi

» Accusing New Labour of laying the foundations for a police state is nothing new. It has been part of Tory and Lib Dem rhetoric for the past eight years and until recently had lacked real substance. That is now changing, with the events of the past two months showing the actions of our chief constables becoming ever more politicised in our national affairs and becoming more like the former East German Stasi in increasing persecution of BNP members engaged in legal activities in particular. Furthermore, this politicisation of our Police is spreading down from the chief constables to the humblest of PC Plods, knowing that to resist the trend will block any promotion and threaten their index-linked pensions available at 55. Having said that, the BNP still has the support, secretly of course, of a growing number of police officers.

The police chiefs' blatant entry into politics was dramatically revealed when the Government attempted to alter the law so that terrorist suspects could be detained for up to 90 days without charge. After this proposal was defeated, Charles Clarke, the Home Secretary was forced to admit that he had urged chief constables to lobby Labour MPs asking them to support the proposals. Spearheaded by Sir Ian Blair, chief of the Met, 35 of the 43 chief constables did so by e-mails, phone calls or letters. . . Their reason for doing so were summed up succinctly in an editorial in the *Daily Telegraph* of November 11th:

"Regrettably, ambitious police officers have worked out that their way to get on in life now is to do exactly what the Government would like them to do. There is no question of debate, or giving advice from a position of experience. Anyone who wishes to be a chief constable these days knows well that toeing the Home Office line on social liberalism, 'inclusivity' and anti-racism is going to stand him in far better stead than a commitment to boring old law enforcement."

Two former Tory Cabinet Ministers, Stephen Dorrell and Peter Lilley, claimed that some chief constables had "acquiesced" to the demands for them to endorse the 90 days policy because they would shortly be up for re-selection as a result of the Government's plans to merge police forces. So instead of there being 43 English police forces, they would be reduced to 12 in the EU inspired plan for Great Britain to be broken down into Scotland, Wales, and twelve 'regions' (the same as in the last Euro Elections) replacing 'England'. Protests in local areas all over England indicate that this plan goes against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of police officers and the public they serve.

Persecution of BNP activists

The cases being brought against BNP leader Nick Griffin and a leading activist, Mark Collett, could not have got as far as they have without the enthusiastic support of West Yorkshire police. They reflect an increasing campaign throughout England, Scotland and Wales, almost certainly



on order from New Labour's hierarchy, of actions against BNP leafleters, *Freedom* newspaper-sellers and organisers of private members' meetings that would have met the approval of the Stasi communist police. Here is just one recent example:

In mid-September, BNP members Darren Charles and Frank Wright were arrested by the local police after being verbally abused by UAL Leftists when handing out leaflets in Barrow-in-Furness. They were standard BNP leaflets which had been distributed in hundreds of thousands without hindrance all over the country.

Darren and Frank were then locked up in police cells for several hours, during which time the home of Darren Charles was searched by the police and his computer, mobile phone and copies of *Freedom* and *Identity* confiscated. The police also took photos of three flags on his study wall on the grounds that they were 'racist'. The flags were the Union flag, the Cross of St. George and the Red Hand of Ulster.

Darren and Frank have already been bailed after two court appearances and are due again in court this month on the following charges.

1. Publishing racially inflammatory material.
2. Distributing racially inflammatory materials.
3. Racially aggravated public order.
4. Refusing to be searched (under Section 5).

The BNP legal team are handling this so-called 'case', therefore I will make no comment at this stage other than to say: Are we to assume that the Barrow police are as idiotic as they would appear in not realising that Darren and Frank can hardly be charged with 'publishing' the leaflets when it is stated quite clearly that they are published officially by the BNP?

John Bean



Lessons Learnt From Our First Annual Conference

» *"Why a conference? Why constitutional reform?" This was the title of Nick Griffin's opening speech at the BNP's first annual conference, held in central London last month. The event was a great success, despite teething problems (only to be expected with any new departure) with things from invitations to the venue. But the questions above are so important that Identity has asked Mr. Griffin to answer them in his main column here this month.*

» Is the British National Party essentially a private club for people who broadly agree with its leader, or is it a serious movement for national and ethnic survival and rebirth? This question has become steadily more pressing as the BNP has grown from a much derided and ineffective pressure group into a fanatically loathed (by the Establishment) but genuine electoral alternative and political reference point for millions of our people. It is a question which we cannot avoid answering any longer, for to remain, or become, the former would doom us to certain failure.

Since its foundation in 1982, the British National Party has had an autocratic constitution, vesting virtually unlimited power in its elected leader and broadly described as the 'leadership principle'. This near dictatorial arrangement has been modified somewhat in recent years, first by the creation of a formal Advisory Council with limited but definite failsafe powers, by increasingly transparent accounting practices, and more recently by the discovery that the party constitution's purported granting to the leader the power to summarily expel anyone he wanted was in breach of English law and hence not worth the paper on which it was written.

The autocratic constitution had its origins in the chaos and discontent that tore apart the British nationalist movement at the end of the false dawn of the 1970s. While personality clashes, relative inexperience and rampant egotism played a significant part in that disaster, various survivors from the wreckage of so many hopes also reached the unavoidable conclusion that a large part of the problem had been structural: A naively democratic constitution had left the



organisation easy prey to a mixture of cranks, enemy plants, malcontents and good people frustrated by smears and lack of sustained progress.

It was this experience, together with the propaganda and practical considerations operating in a small tight-knit group striving for supremacy over several equally tiny nationalist rivals, that shaped the BNP's constitution. It was written in a hurry for an organisation for which external political power - even at the level of a town council - was a pipedream so distant that it was not even considered.

To an extent, however, that early constitution was fit for purpose. Shielded from the factionalism that the failure to resolve their constitutional contradictions tended to create in its rivals, the BNP not only prospered relative to them, but was also able to overcome perhaps the greatest challenge of all for any small organisation with few assets and many personal loyalties - a change of leadership.

As a result, there has tended to be a somewhat complacent feeling that "what ain't broke don't need fixing" and we have pressed on with making external advances without looking too

closely at apparently unimportant things such as our behind-the-scenes policy-forming and decision-making structures.

TIME TO REFORM

Over the last year or so, however, I have been forced to the conclusion that such attitudes are misplaced and potentially disastrous. Personal insights at the party's very centre, a careful study of the continuing outbreaks of unrest in UKIP, extensive reading about the internal workings and problems of other radical 'outsider' parties (ranging from the early Labour party to Sinn Féin and Hizb-ut-Tahrir), and my own first-hand experiences from more than thirty years of activism in the British nationalist movement, have all combined to convince me that it is time for the BNP to undergo the biggest constitutional and organisational reform in its history; indeed, in the entire history of British nationalism.

To deal with the constitutional question first, there are four key reasons why things have to change:

First, the "one man band" approach that had some real advantages in a tiny and simple organisation is simply

unable to cope with any further growth and levels of sophistication than we have now. True, all sorts of things can be - and indeed have been - delegated, but an organisation founded on the principle of a single leader being responsible for everything means that even delegated powers tend to behave like boomerangs, unless the recipient is confident enough to wield them all on his lonesome, in which case there then emerges an increasingly chronic problem of un-coordination, whereby the left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing, and neither has the faintest idea what the brain is planning next.

One man cannot cope any longer with what we have now, let alone with the vastly more complicated machinery that needs to be constructed if we are to become serious contenders for national power. But just to subdivide our policy and decision-making between individuals whose main point of contact is still through just one massively powerful leader would be a recipe for the creation of a myriad of little rival fiefdoms, each nominally under control, supervision and direction, but in fact doing their own thing.

Worse, should the one common thread holding them all together be snapped by, for example, long imprisonment or assassination on the Dutch model, then an organisation envisaged and created by one man on a mercurial, ad-hoc basis, would probably prove incapable of being run by anyone else - at least not without a very difficult and disruptive change-over period. This problem was identified by the brilliant Louisiana populist organiser and 'demagogue', Huey Long, described by the liberal elite as "the most dangerous man in America" before he was gunned down and the edifice he had created crumbled to dust as he had predicted it would.

ABUSE OF POWER

Second, any group in which one person has near total power is by its very nature susceptible to that one person abusing that power, or taking the organisation in a direction contrary to the wishes of its core membership. In fact, this danger is easy to overrate, since unless such a body had a vast sum of money with which to sustain its

Annual Conference Motions

ENERGY CRISIS

MOTION: This conference believes that the looming fossil fuel energy crisis makes it necessary for BNP energy policy to include the construction of a new generation of nuclear power plants, using the safest possible modern technology to generate the power needed to run a core network of essential services.

[Passed with a clear majority with a substantial minority against]

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

MOTION: This conference believes that we should adopt into party policy the preservation and promotion of British Constitutional Law as set out in Magna Carta 1215, the Act of Supremacy 1559, the Bill of Rights 1689 and the Act of Settlement 1701. Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement, which is an attachment to the Bill of Rights, are Fundamental Law and may not be amended or repealed. Common Law takes precedence over any parliamentary act. Successive governments which have all taken an Oath of Allegiance to uphold the traditional laws and customs of this land have passed many laws which contravene Common Law and which are therefore unconstitutional, illegal and void. These laws must be challenged and our rights and freedoms restored as guaranteed under the British Constitution as enshrined in the above.

[Passed with a clear majority, a solid minority against, and several abstentions]

ABORTION

MOTION: This conference believes that the BNP should oppose social abortion.

[Passed by an overwhelming majority.]

This motion also gave rise to an additional, related motion: "This conference believes that the BNP should

organisation while pushing away that core membership, to alienate them would be to commit suicide. Having seen and been involved in just such an error in the late 1980s, it is not something I would countenance again.

The mere fact, however, that such a danger exists in theory under the BNP's present "just one man, no need to vote" constitution makes it easy for

oppose the promotion of social abortion, and campaign for a mothers' wage. **[This was carried by a very large majority]**

MAJOR REFORMS

MOTION: (accepted amendments in bold): This conference believes that the BNP's experienced and committed activists should have a greater input into policy and organisational decision-making - something that should not be attained merely by dint of holding a membership card or being a financial backer. We therefore call **for a working party of six from the advisory council, plus the party chairman**, to produce a set of proposals for constitutional reform whose implementation would both reward with greater influence within our movement, and encourage, long-term commitment, steady activism in a variety of fields and an effective understanding of our core aims. These proposals should be debated and honed in the first instance **at regional meetings of regional officials, branch and group organisers and fundholders, and elected councillors**, but should be produced in completed form by the start of next year, ready either for immediate adoption, or for submitting to a properly convened EGM should the changes be of a nature which would require a membership vote before their adoption. Time and tide wait for no party, and the present BNP structure must be radically overhauled if we are to seize the time and ride the coming wave of history to victory.

[Passed by an overwhelming majority]

AGM

MOTION: This conference believes that the constitution of the party should be changed to make it compulsory to have an Annual General Meeting, at which all paid up members are entitled to attend and vote.

[Defeated by an overwhelming majority]

Searchlight agent provocateurs, malcontents, 'rival' grouplets and assorted other vermin to keep on raising the hoary chestnut that the wicked leader is about to drag the party kicking and screaming into either selling out its principles or donning jackboots.

That there is no truth in either claim doesn't make a blind bit of difference; the fact that, in theory, it could be done,



means that disruptive capital can be and is made by malicious fantasies that it might be done.

Given that 99 per cent of anti-Establishment groups that fail do so not on account of naked repression or unfavourable external circumstances, but rather because of internal factional squabbling over how many of their particular angels their leaders should fit on a pinhead, a structure that institutionalises the possibility of high-handed decision making over the heads of those who make the party tick is an invitation to disaster. The fact that the naively democratic shambles of the movement in the 1970s went to the other extreme and suffered accordingly does not disprove this assertion, although it does spotlight the need to get the balance right in the new and more stable system we are setting out to create.

The third new factor to be taken into account is the fact that increased political success brings a fresh and very important group into the internal political influence equation - elected representatives. Councillors (and in due course MEPs and MPs) are by their very nature answerable to their constituents, and likely to be more in touch with the overall political climate in which we are operating than anybody else. To expect men and women in this position to be the mouthpieces for policies over which they have absolutely no means of influence, let alone control, is risibly unrealistic.

STRIKING A BALANCE

That is not to say that they should have the whole say, or anything like the whole say. After all, someone might be a brilliant local councillor and community leader and not have a clue about the really big political picture, let alone questions as to how that picture might develop and what preparations we have to make to meet such future challenges. Once again, a balance needs to be struck, but that means moving from where we are at present.

Fourth, if we are to build an organisation that really can win, we need to bring on board a very large number of good, capable, ambitious new recruits. Our present autocratic system, whereby the members choose the party leader by annual inertia or totally democratic election, and that

'Preventing Extremism Together' Working Groups

August - October 2005

leader then wields total power on their behalf, creates three potentially massive problems in this regard:

A) Large numbers of such potential recruits have already had bitter experiences of politicians in other parties who, while supposedly accountable, in fact ride roughshod over the wishes of their voters or members. Having already been bitten once in this way, they are highly unlikely to come on board with an organisation that makes a positive virtue out of giving them no chance of influence over its future direction at all. If our future hopes for the creation of a mass movement of national rebirth are to be anything other than a cloud cuckoo land fantasy, then we have to create a system which talented new people can see - once they have proved themselves and earned their spurs - gives them a real voice in exchange for undertaking real responsibilities.

B) Since the dangers facing our nation are so great, some of those necessary capable new recruits would always swallow their reservations even if we took no steps at all to change the present system. Bitter experience and common sense, however, combine to tell us that the lack of accountability through a constitutional framework recognisably within the British political tradition will repeatedly become either a genuine bone of contention for many of them, or at the very least be a glaringly obvious injustice and point of friction that can all too easily be worked on by troublemakers and opposition

infiltrators. Alternatively, the operational restrictions created by a system in which one man decides everything important would mean that their bright ideas are likely to break on the rock of organisational inertia, leading to their talents being, at best, only partly deployed or, even worse, to their feeling unvalued, unwanted and dropping out.

C) If, despite the first two points here, external circumstances and the dedication of our hardcore leads to a significant political breakthrough, there is every chance of a sudden influx of a large number of complete newcomers. These, inevitably, will tend to bring with them their own confused, floppy, incoherent, rather liberal version of conservative nationalism. When equally inevitably, their early high hopes of an easy jaunt to power are dashed, all too many of these are likely to switch from blaming people outside the party - the government, the media and so on - for such reverses, and blame the leadership and its unacceptably 'hardline' policies and image. Under our present constitution, the one and only thing that such people can do to relieve their understandable frustration is to rally behind a leadership challenger who promises softer policies, the removal of individuals with inconvenient pasts, lions lying down with lambs, and double helpings of apple pie and cream.

EXPERIMENTAL CONFERENCE

All the factors above contributed to the decision to hold the party's first ever Annual Conference, and to allow a limited - and admittedly somewhat arbitrary and imperfect - franchise for submitting, debating and voting on matters of policy and constitutional reform.

The conference was necessarily experimental, and is in its present form purely advisory. That said, the fact that it was composed overwhelmingly of the volunteer organisers and fundholders who form the backbone of the BNP gives its decisions enormous moral weight.

Conference decisions do not bind the leadership under this system, but any leader who rode roughshod over the stated position on an important issue of a large majority of the party's

movers and shakers would clearly be riding for a fall.

While not undermining the speed of leadership decision-making that is one of the most valuable fruits of a constitution based on the leadership principle, the creation of this annual conference mechanism has at a stroke introduced a very healthy measure of consultation and collective decision making into the heart of the party.

That said, the creation of this new institution is only a single step on the road to a complete set of constitutional arrangements which must both give the people who really make the BNP work the power to help decide its future and to use their initiative to build its organisation, and simultaneously guard it against being swamped by latecomers so as to forget its *raison d'être* and become a mere vehicle for personal advancement rather than the instrument of national survival which our time demands.

This is why the most important motion passed by this first conference was the one proposing the establishment of a top-level working party, charged with the task of producing a set of draft proposals for the conversion of the BNP from an autocracy into a meritocracy - the best and highest form of democracy. This is

enough, has highlighted just how little time we have left.

The same has to be said of several less dramatic but no less significant developments in the UK. At one level there was the fact that this Ramadan saw no fewer than 38 Muslim community radio stations operating in Britain - this in addition to the ceaseless promotion of Islam by the mainstream media, particularly the BBC.

At another level are the recommendations of the Home Office-organised 'Preventing Extremism Together' Working Groups, set up in the wake of the July Muslim suicide bombings. These produced more than 150 pages of interlinked recommendations, almost all of them supposedly aiming to wean British-based Muslims away from extremism by dint of giving huge amounts of taxpayers' money to 'moderate' Islamics (see cover opposite).

ISLAMIC TWIN TRACK

So the 'extreme' wing uses Labour government and council grants to recruit and train suicide bombers to blow up buses, tube trains and innocent commuters. And in response the government throws money at the

strategy, and one that will provide a huge boost to the creation of Islamic hegemony in our nominally Western, Christian, democratic country.

Vital though contesting and winning elections remains, this Islamist juggernaut cannot be opposed by electioneering alone. The British resistance must also learn to play the politics of identity and community - though not of violence, let alone suicide bombing.

But it will only happen if we in the BNP - the only effective, conscious, organised and remotely well-resourced manifestation of that resistance - change our constitution not only so as to become an embryonic party of government, but also to provide the mechanism whereby our activists are encouraged and helped to move into the new fields in which the resistance must operate.

Involvement in things such as deep-roots community work, youth clubs, popular culture, single issue pressure groups and such like must become as much part of the normal, routine activity of BNP activists as leafleting and canvassing. Knowing that this needs to be the case is not enough; we have to take positive steps to make it happen. That is why, near the start of this article I wrote of the need for organisational improvements side-by-side with constitutional reform.

It is why, in my concluding speech to the conference, I stated that to win we need not only willingness to sacrifice, and unity of purpose and action, but also a "one hundred-fold increase in our organisational effectiveness."

That was not a mere scrap of rhetoric or a flight of fancy; it is a cold, hard fact. Without it, however external circumstances move in our favour, we cannot and will not win. That is why, as we are working together to create and hone a radically improved constitution and organisation, while we must always keep our feet on the ground, our eyes must be on the very summit of the mountain of power.

Having already become by far the most effective, and most widely supported, organisation in the entire history of British nationalism, it would be easy to rest on our laurels. We cannot afford to do so, and we are not going to do so. Now is the time, not for self-congratulation and complacency, but for ambition and urgency.



not a matter of obscure Greek words and shades of political philosophy, it is a matter of our national and ethnic survival. The next phase of the Islamic Intifada against Europe, unveiled on the streets of France, but coming to Britain in even worse form soon

'moderate' wing to give them networks of community centres, self-help groups, leadership training grants, youth clubs, anti-discrimination campaigns, etc, etc. Make no mistake - by accident or design, this is a classic good-cop/bad-cop, twin-track



Decline into Tyranny

» *David Hamilton outlines the legislation that has been gradually introduced since 1948 to create the multiracial state. Supported by all the old parties, it has led to a new tyranny for Britain's original inhabitants.*

» The origin of this embryonic totalitarian state was the reaction to Hitler's barbarity, but it has become an oppressive tyranny itself. It was a move to the other extreme and is now persecuting us, the "whites". It began because the then ruling class lost their nerve and let the Socialist-Marxist alliance gain control.

In a *Daily Mail* article in 1948 the future Prime Minister Harold Macmillan had written, "with one or two exceptions I can see nothing different in modern Liberalism from modern Conservatism. This is the faith of a Conservative".

In a speech to the 1961 Conservative party conference Ian Macleod said, "I believe, quite simply in the brotherhood of man - men of all races, all colours, all creeds." The second reading of the Commonwealth Immigration Act that year received this prognostication from C. Royle, Labour (Salford West). "I look forward to a multi-racial society...world peace will not be assured until everybody in the world is coffee-coloured." He repeated this four years later from the House of Lords.

What Sir Alfred Sherman described as the colonisation of Britain by the Third World used to be known as the creation of "little Harlems". Multi-racialists were so fanatical about their aim that they even ignored Martin Luther King himself, who warned of danger from "little Harlems" when he addressed members of Parliament in December 1964, on his way to collect the Noble Peace prize from Oslo. He had just visited Brixton.

Socialist MP Donald Chapman of Birmingham Northfield took the other side: "Problems there may be for us in this migration. But let us approach them with a sense of our special responsibility for things in Jamaica and on the basis of the total flow of migrants to Britain, white and black, without colour discrimination." If we try to get a clear picture of this proposed utopia we are defeated by its empty abstractions and a vague notion of the outcome.

The first attempt to oppress native people was by Labour MP Reginald Sorensen in 1951 with the proposed 'anti-colour bar' bill. This was followed by nine attempts in the '50s and '60s by arch utopian Fenner Brockway, Labour MP for Slough.


In 1965 the Socialists finally began to get legislation on to the statute books. The first was introduced by the Home Secretary Frank Soskice in 1965. This was followed in 1968 by a stronger Racial Discrimination Act, which was designed by Roy Jenkins but introduced by James Callaghan. Prior to this there was a wedge driven into any real idea of equality by the Local Government Act of 1966. Section 11. "Subject to the provisions of this

section the Secretary of State may pay to local authorities who in his opinion are required to make special provision in the exercise of any of their functions in consequence of the presence within their areas of substantial numbers of immigrants from the Commonwealth whose languages or customs differ from those of the community, grants of such amounts as he may with the consent of the Treasury determine on account of expenditure of such descriptions (being in respect of the employment of staff) as he may so determine." (Their words, not mine!)

The man who brought the engine for totalitarianism and oppression into our legal system, with the Campaign for Racial Equality and the 1976 Race Relations Act, was Roy Jenkins. A biographer, John Campbell (Weidenfield & Nicolson 1983) tells us, he believed, "that immigration was good for Britain and if people resisted they should be socially engineered into accepting it. Commonwealth immigrants like previous waves of immigrants from the Norman Conquest, to the refugees of the '30s, could help overcome 'our natural Island lethargy'".

He introduced legal prejudice and discrimination against "Whites" in his 1976 Race Relations Act that continued the move into totalitarianism by creating the Commission for Racial Equality to co-ordinate all witch-finding activities. It was based on a vague idea of "Race." The explicatory passage was section 35:

"Nothing in parts 11 and 1V should render unlawful any act done in affording persons of a particular group access to facilities and services to meet the special needs of that group in regard to their education, training or welfare, or any ancillary benefits." This licences the provision of "education, training or welfare facilities and services" to "persons of a particular racial group", just because they belong to that racial group.



"With one or two exceptions I can see nothing different in modern Liberalism from modern Conservatism."

The dispossession of the indigenous population, us, was proceeding apace. The new law introduced open privilege for the ethnic groups and discriminated against the natives and enshrined this racial prejudice in law. This represents a break in our legal traditions and a new departure into totalitarian control of social relations. The Anglo-Saxon Celtic people are being dispossessed.

Under Racial Awareness Training, a method of brainwashing from America in the 1980s, local councils began sending employers, employees and decision-makers for thought control. It was one-sided and was "to challenge individual prejudices and values and change them". It stemmed from the ideas of Judith Katz who held that "racism is inherent in whites". There were examples in the USA of blonde-haired people, usually women, being racially abused until they broke down and sobbed. The fact that it was done to blondes shows that it is a racist act upon us. A social worker who went on one of these in Birmingham told me that at the beginning the multi-racial group got on well, but at the end blacks and Asians had been turned against the whites.

Anyone who doubts this should consider the malicious hatred directed towards Dead White Males. Our greatest artists, writers and thinkers must all now be ritually condemned and their works besmirched in an attempt to destroy our civilisation.

The Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain's "Parekh" report (Runnymede Trust 2002) treats our dispossession and deculturalisation as something that only needs formalising. On page 38 it states, "It is widely understood that Englishness, and therefore by extension Britishness, is racially coded...unless these deep-rooted antagonisms to racial and cultural differences can be defeated in practice, as well as symbolically written out of the story, the idea of a multi-cultural post-nation remains an empty promise." In that report we are told that we are being wiped out in order to build a multiracial Nirvana from scratch.

Page xiv makes the surprising assertion that the people of Scotland and Wales have more of a sense of multiple identity (sic). Englishness is also in the process of being "redefined." Well, is that what we want, for a clique of Marxists to redefine our culture, communities and our identities? Based on their notions of how abstract persons will interact in an imaginary world that they have yet to create? They advise that the way forward is for the "United Kingdom to formally declare itself a multi-cultural society", page xxi. By stealth, and with the Conservatives' passive agreement, we are on the verge of being co-opted into a totalitarian state.

BRAINWASHING FOR US

People are inducted into their culture, community, history and traditions quite naturally as they grow up. The abstract method though requires a sort of schoolbook learning process as in the republican "Citizenship classes" which are supposed to make all foreigners British. This process only acts on the surface, the conscious mind, whereas the natural traditional way imbues the nature of the person as it is internalised deep into the unconscious as a unifying bond. The superficial totalitarian method advocated by Parekh has to be imposed by a system of brainwashing,



secret police and psychiatric units. However, immigrants are allowed to perpetuate divisions by inducting their children into their own traditions. They are exempt from the oppression!

Judge Mapherson began his investigation already prejudiced against the police and introduced ideas straight from the clairvoyant fiction of George Orwell. Recommendation 12 states, "A racist incident is any incident, which is perceived to be racist by the victim, or any other person. Recommendation 13 adds, "That the term "racist incident" must be understood to include crimes and non-crimes in policing terms. Both must be investigated with equal commitment." Now we can be investigated for committing non-crimes!


Last year adverts were placed on the London underground from a new type of police officer, Commander Dick, head of the Met's Diversity Directorate, with its Soviet-Gestapo style title, asking for anyone with information on people saying politically incorrect things to report them to her. The famous *Sun* writer Richard Littlejohn was visited by the police for a spoof on homosexuals in his column.

There are already purges in our police to root out racist officers. The previous chief of the Met, Sir John Stevens, started to plant informers in police training classes to spy for and report on "racist" police officers, an action which is being continued by Sir Ian Blair. This can be presented in a positive light but really comes straight from the Soviet Union. Do these police officers know what they are doing? Well, they must do, but it is to their advantage to have us under control in a totalitarian state.

Anti-Semitism is now part of multi-racial thinking as we have seen with Ken Livingstone's recent remarks and the secret deals between the Government and Muslims. Television presenter Robert Kilroy-Silk was sacked by the BBC for making rather general comments on Arabs. At the same time the BBC signed the former editor-in-chief of Al-Jazeera.

To the innocent people who think asylum is an accident, I quote from Dele Oguntimojou in the *Salisbury Review* of Spring 2003: "(We) do not know how the youth in the poor African village is being seduced by lush advertising to shed his native dress for blue jeans; to retune his ears from the traditional hi-life to the drum and bass of hip-hop and Brit pop. Even now the British Council is busy across Africa training the next generation of immigrants in the language of the destination country."

The liberal left's Utopia never comes, any more than Stalin's 5-year plans did or Mao's "Cultural Revolution". We just get stuck in their totalitarianism.



A Present to the Crescent?

» Guest writer, Rev. John G. Lovejoy was a co-founder of the patriotic magazine *Steadfast*. Although it is concerned with English culture in particular, he says he has no wish to snub the Scots or Welsh, "rather I do not presume to speak on their behalf".

Identity, like the BNP, is non-sectarian, and for this reason we have not previously published the growing number of articles that are submitted by practising Christians who are fighting a rearguard action to defend the fundamentals of Christian belief, particularly in view of the growing hostility shown to those beliefs by Islam. Most readers will find what John Lovejoy has to say of some considerable interest, including those who confess to be pagans. What he has to say is a personal view, of course, and not necessarily that of the British National Party.

» My chosen topic is a very unpopular, sensitive topic: one which might even be called the great unmentionable of the present time! It was prompted in part by the lead article in *Voice of Freedom*, December 2004, headed "Defend Our Christian Culture", and also the letter from Edward Hales in the same issue.

Now, the most important things to settle for human beings living in society are:

A sense of who they are - their shared culture and beliefs generally, and origins.

An awareness of what they believe in common - a shared perception of what is Holy.

While we are individuals, and thus free to think and to experience autonomously, nevertheless we are social beings, and the answers to these fundamental questions have normally been shared in particular traditional societies. Indeed, if you have a group of people who do not know who they are, and have no shared beliefs, then it is questionable whether they are truly a human society or could possibly become one. Where then does this leave modern English people?

In regard to who we are, the

English (Angles, Saxons, Jutes) were groupings of Germanic tribes whose culture was very clear before they ever arrived in Britain. When they did arrive from the North West coastlands of Europe it was a mass migration, for the Germanic tribes as a whole were wont to move to other territories as and when need arose. The Early English were in this respect just like the Goths, Vandals, Langobards, Alans and Burgunds, to name a few. And they brought their indigenous religion with them.

The Early English were Heathen, with a not ignoble religion not so very different from that of the earlier Celts, but closer still to that of their Scandinavian cousins.

UNDERPINNED

The story of the conversion to the Christian faith in the seventh century is also well known, though not nearly as widely known as it should be. Be that as it may, English culture was underpinned, as it were, by the Christian Faith in its First Millennium form from the seventh century onwards and the map of England is studded with sites and tales of early

English saints and martyrs. The early English received the Faith enthusiastically and themselves sent missionaries to the North of Europe.

So what went wrong? Christianity in England today appears to many an outsider as being divided, distorted, defective and diluted. All too often the leaders appear to promote a watered-down teaching in conformity with current liberal trends. The vast majority of English people do not practise the Christian Faith. Instead, what do we find?

A small and diminishing minority are actively C of E, but the Anglican Church is itself divided into sharply contrasting tendencies.

The older non-conformist groups struggle, their chapels turned to other uses, though the Baptists remain stronger than most.

The Roman Catholic Church seems to be prone to self-harm, beset by scandals and a chronic shortage of priests. Cardinal Basil Hume is affectionately remembered.

American-style evangelical groups claim some young people, but their theology is shallow, and they rely on electronically-enhanced music and a generally "flashy" presentation.

Still others have turned to Buddhism and other oriental religions and The Tao.

Others again have tried to revive paganism in its Northern forms. An able and respected proponent of this tradition, which merits attention as being that which preceded the coming of Christianity, is Garman Lord. See: *The Way of the Heathen A Handbook of Greater Theodism* by Garman Lord ISBN 1-929340-01-X. Publisher: THEOD, Watertown, New York, 2000.

The influence of American cults and fringe sects remains fairly constant.

Meanwhile, a very large proportion of the population reject 'organised religion' out of hand and go in for spiritual D.I.Y, indulging in various New Age practices in all sorts of ways that are hard to classify.

An even larger proportion of the population seem to reject religion altogether and profess a thorough going materialism - atheistic or agnostic - while regarding the whole subject of Christianity as variously meaningless, pointless, or in bad taste.

And then there is Islam. Too many reports have reached me of young English people turning to Islam for me to discount this. For some time I have

foreseen the likelihood of the conversion to Islam of disaffected English youths, largely cut off from the culture of their own people and also sick of 'western' materialism. They may have had no more experience of a Christian church than of the interior of a flying saucer.

Indeed, through immigration Islam has by now a firm demographic base in England, and here we have a religion whose adherents are clear about what they believe, are firm in their commitment to live by their faith, and whose community is shaped and formed by it. In addition, Islam, retains ancient cultural traditions and art forms, such as the Arabic orthography.

Meanwhile, the English confront Islam with a form of Christianity which we have allowed to become degraded over many centuries of the second millennium and which most of us have rejected altogether.

THE GREAT SPLIT

I repeat the question, what went wrong? What happened to the Faith of the seventh century saints? I think the rot set in when the Western Church started to drift away from the Eastern Church in the years leading to the definitive break of 1054AD. Theology

came to be expressed in Latin instead of the Greek which had been the language of the Bible and of most of the early Church Fathers. The later Roman popes allied the Western Church to powerful rulers such as Charlemagne and the Normans.

Later, as the rise of Islam cut the West off from any easy contact with the Christian East, Western theology came to be pressed into the philosophical mould of neo-Aristotelism, thus distorting belief about God. Later on the Renaissance further warped the presentation of the Faith, not least in art and architecture.

The Reformation and Counter Reformation shattered the Unity of Western Christendom, made theology subject to politics, and the Church subject to human rather than to divine authority. All this resulted in an even stricter schematisation of Catholic theology and codification of canonical discipline, while spirituality was stifled by being intellectualised and schematised to extremes.

The 18th Century saw a rapid decay of English Christianity, with a Government that was hostile to the Faith as a whole, allowing the established Church to languish in worldliness but not permitted to govern its affairs. Methodism arose in reaction, while agricultural and industrial revolutions loosened the bonds of English society.

The 19th Century saw an immense Christian revival, but it was a Christianity torn from its roots, so that the divisions were only exacerbated and widened. Meanwhile, Christianity and Natural Science needlessly became antagonistic.

The 20th Century, especially after two world wars, saw a continuing decay in the strength of the Christian denominations, but this has gone hand in hand with the disintegration and degradation of English society and culture as a whole.

CULTURAL COLLAPSE

What then is to be done? The English people, as I and others have argued elsewhere, are in a condition of cultural collapse and disintegration. Further, the English now lack a firm, clear, cohesive spiritual base for their culture and society, while Islam now threatens, and particularly demographically. Perhaps both Islam and





Buddhism may try to fill the void which the retreat of Christianity seems to have left.

Can all this be put right? I am convinced that it *can*, as long as we succeed in making our people aware of the *first* situation, i.e. of cultural collapse. Then we must get our people to look for a solution to the *second* problem, that of the loss of a coherent spiritual base.

It is in regard to the *second* situation that of the damage done to English Christianity and the need for a credible Faith to underpin English culture and society where I venture to make some definite suggestions.

First, let us recall the conversion of the early English to the Faith of Christ in the seventh century. This happened much earlier than the conversion of Russia and the Northern European tribes. The English were evangelised from Ireland and from Rome, but it is of utmost importance to know that Rome at that time was very different indeed from the Rome of popular perception in the Second Millennium. For one thing it then had a number of Greek monasteries.

MISSION TO ENGLAND

Pope Gregory the Great, who instigated the mission to the English, had served in Constantinople, and Rome itself at that time was heavily under Byzantine influence. For it was in the Eastern Mediterranean in the first millennium, in the area where Greek and Syriac were the predominant languages, that the Christian Faith came to be expressed and worked out ever more clearly through the monastic movement, the Great Councils of the Church, and the writings of the 'Fathers'; St. Basil, St Gregory Nazianzen, St John Chrysostom, and many more.

The fundamentals of the Faith, the meaning of Holy Scripture, were explored and expressed in increasing fullness and clarity, while the Divine Liturgy was given a richness of expression in music, architecture, iconography, such as was to stun the envoys sent later to Constantinople by Prince Vladimir of Russia to enquire into the Christian religion.

Unlike the modern West, spirituality was not torn apart from religion and the way of prayer was explored by countless monks as well



Pope Gregory the Great

as by ordinary people in their homes. Tragically, as we know, Constantinople fell to the Muslim Turks in 1453. By then the centre of gravity of the Eastern Church had passed to Russia in the North, and also to that unique holy place, Mount Athos, in North East Greece, which remains a power house of prayer for the whole Christian world to this very day.

We seem to have strayed from England, but not really. In 670 or thereabout, Theodore of Tarsus, a Greek monk from the city of St Paul, was sent to England as the Archbishop of Canterbury. He worked to organise the infant English Church, including riding around England on horseback to introduced canonical order and later to explain the findings of the Sixth Ecumenical Council held in Constantinople in 680. The English Church was then to be an integral part of the one worldwide Church.

It is at this point that I propose a radical solution.

In the light of all that has been pointed out above, and given the situation of the English and of English Christianity at the present time, I am convinced that the English need to put aside the mess that has resulted from all the events of the Second Millennium and return, in essentials, to what we had received in the First Millennium. Implied here would be a return to a Christian Faith which retained its integrity undistorted, undiminished, undivided, and undiluted - true to its Eastern Mediterranean historical roots, and true to the intentions of its founder.

To this end, we need the help of the Eastern Christians as a whole, but of the Greeks and Russians in particular.

They have clung tenaciously to the Christian Faith in a manner true to its early origins and they have often suffered for it. It is they who have had to bear the brunt of centuries of Islamic rule, on one hand, and of militant atheistic Marxist-Leninism on the other.

With help from the right quarter, therefore, I would call on my fellow English men and women to return to what we once had and start afresh from there.

THE OBJECTIONS

It is here that I anticipate that there will be many objections and that many of those who might agree with me in the statement of the problem might yet look for a very different solution! I understand this. We must engage in dialogue among ourselves.

First, many would prefer a quiet, low-key sort of religion that does not go to extremes and does not make too many demands but is just there, in the background. Is it too cynical to call this approach 'Village Green Anglicanism'? Would such a faith provide a firm cultural base? And would such a thing withstand Islam? More importantly, does such a religion represent the Founder's intention?

Early Christianity as worked out mainly in the East did consist of extremes, but not in the way one might fear. Rather, the Faith was expressed repeatedly as a balance of two antithetical extremes, at first sight mutually contradictory, but only because of the limitations of the human mind and language. This balance of extremes runs all through the Christian Faith, giving depth but

precluding both fanaticism and mediocrity.

Again, how can the Christian Faith be reconciled with modern scientific knowledge? Such difficulties have arisen largely through the Western reduction of the Faith to a particularly philosophical expression and with the over-use of human logic.

Eastern theology, despite its immense depth, does not lead to incompatibility with the results of natural science for it approaches these questions in a very different way. For one thing, spirituality and theology are not torn apart in the Eastern tradition. It would help too if those active in the scientific disciplines were to remember that their field of enquiry is self-limited to the physical order such as is amenable to the physical senses, either directly or through instruments. It would also help if Western scientists were to perceive that American evangelicals are not mainstream Christians but are very far from the early Holy tradition.

And what about those who feel they simply cannot accept the Christian Faith at all. Whether Early, Western or Eastern?

Of course we must have this freedom and from a Christian point of view it is God-given in any case. Only remember the English direly need a firmly based set of beliefs such as might underpin their culture and way of life. Dissenters and minorities are not incompatible with that position. Oppression or persecution of the latter would be.

In short, to point out a return to a Faith that we once had, but seem to have lost, is at least a way that deserves to be considered, respected and explored. We might also recall that it was precisely when Islam was first in the ascendant that we English elected to embrace the Christian Faith, and that was in its Orthodox form and not in the defective Arian

form as with our cousins the Goths and Vandals.

Here I realise I must at last say something about the *political* relevance of all this. This is not easy. A letter in this vein to my MP was not even acknowledged. We are living in a secularist liberal democracy where religion is supposed to be a purely individual private matter but possibly helpful in providing comfort to some senior citizens. It is generally regarded as something right off the political scale. Discussion of the subject is considered 'bad form'.

Until 7th July 2005 that is. After that, I noted that front rank politicians were bending over backwards to listen to Muslim leaders while these same Muslim leaders were prominent on our TV screens for weeks. In contrast, Christian leaders were hardly seen. We are a long way from ancient Byzantium where the Emperor and Government had to listen to the monks and to display holy icons when the foe was at the walls!

ROCK-FIRM BASE

I will be blunt about this. Politicians must realise that the only way to withstand Islam is to help the English (and the other indigenous peoples of Britain) to reverse their cultural disintegration, and that this entails a rediscovery of a rock-firm spiritual base for this to happen. The alternative for the politicians will eventually be for them to say: "If you cannot beat them, join them", and then to encourage Islam to displace what remains of the Christian Church in this land.

Many politicians seem unwilling even to think about cultural disintegration. Those that do are usually still shy of thinking of religious beliefs. It is the new unmentionable! But in the end politicians have to face realities. Some, I now read, see Christianity as

increasingly effete and marginal, so in consequence it is Islam that they now have to deal with. Others though - and those who read *Identity* may well take this line - will stand firm in the conviction that Christianity in some sort is the natural 'back drop', if not foundation, of English culture as well as that of Scotland and Wales (*I would include Ireland - Editor*) and thus may be more receptive to what I have just written.

"And what is wrong with Islam anyway?" I can imagine a certain type of politician asking: I have in mind 'Respect' and those who produce *Socialist Worker*. I would reply to them that my objection to Islam is entirely theological. Unlike Buddhism, for example, Islam *begins* with an explicit rejection of the fundamentals of the Christian Faith, and is thus wholly incompatible with it. Buddhism, it is true, comes up with very different answers to those of Christianity, but that is only because it begins with different questions.

I hope that nothing that I have written here gives offence to Christians of the various traditions. In any case I admire them for clinging on to the Faith at a time and place where this is more than usually difficult and discouraging. English, as well as Scots and Welsh, Christians must stand firm and meanwhile they need to ask themselves where they are at, how far they have wandered from where they first began, and then be ready to seek help from the relevant administrations of the Eastern Church. The Archpatriarchate of Constantinople (mainly Greek speaking) is already well represented in Britain, as is the Patriarchate of Moscow. English is widely used in the Liturgy.

Finally, I would add that nothing tends to work well unless it is true to its origins and roots, and that applies to the Christian Faith too. I might also add a *caveat*. What I have urged above may or may not be considered culturally or politically desirable in the contemporary English situation. But in the last resort there is only one good reason for becoming a Christian Orthodox or otherwise and that is that one is convinced in his or her heart that it is true and that one is called to do so. That said, a mass return to the Faith in a form true to the original is, I believe, possible. Such a development would have an immeasurably powerful effect.

Christian Constantinople lost to Islam 1453





Why Britain's Trade Deficit Matters

» Britain's trade deficit is becoming a considerable problem, judging by even the Establishment papers. In this introductory article Alan Goodacre says unfortunately it is a subject liable to deliberate confusion by those who wish to ignore it, simply because most people don't quite understand what it is, or why it matters, even though they intuitively sense that something is wrong when we have one. So it's worth thinking through the basics with care, because once one truly grasps them, one will understand why it's a problem and become immune to the deliberately confusing arguments spewed out by globalists who want to cover it up. Just follow the logic below, step-by-step:

1. Nations engage in trade with one another. This means Britons sell goods to people of other nations, and buy goods from them.

2. You don't get goods for free in this world. So when we buy goods from foreign nations we have to give them something in return.

3. There are only three things we can possibly give them:

- a. Goods we produce today.
- b. Goods we produced in the past.
- c. Goods we promise to produce in the future.

Other nations aren't Father Christmas, so they won't give us their goods if we don't do one of these things. And why on earth should they?

4. Here's what **No.3** above really means:

- a. Is when they sell us Sony televisions and we sell them Rolls Royces.
- b. Is when they sell us Sony televisions and we sell them office buildings in London.
- c. Is when they sell us Sony televisions and we go into debt to them to get the money to pay for them.

5. In case you haven't guessed already, **b.** and **c.** are what happens when we have a trade deficit. This is because we are not covering the cost of our imports with the value of our own exports, so we have to make up the gap with something else that has value to our foreign trading partners. Borrowed money will do. So will a share of our existing assets.

6. So why are **b.** and **c.** a problem?

For a start, because they're unsustainable; they can't go on forever. In case **b.**, we have only so many existing assets we can sell off to foreigners. In case **c.**, we can only pile up so much debt. On the other hand, in case **a.**, we can go on producing goods, and exchanging them for whatever we want from abroad, indefinitely. That's why it's good to be a nation with large exports, like Germany or Japan. They can not only obtain anything they want that foreigners have, they can count on being able to do so forever - or at least as long as they remain strong exporters.

The second problem is that **b.** and **c.** destroy British jobs. Here's why:

In case **a.**, when we were selling Rolls Royces in return, this meant we had to employ people to produce them, and



we could afford to do so because the foreign sale brought in money to pay the workers.

But in case **b.**, the office building has *already been* produced, so no jobs *today* are created by selling it to some foreigner. The foreigner is just as happy to become the proud owner of a £100,000,000 office building in London as he would have been to get £100,000,000 in Rolls Royces, but we don't get any jobs out of it. In essence, we're cannibalising our past production of goods to pay for present consumption. We're living off our past.

And in case **c.**, while it is true that jobs *will* have to be created to produce goods at some time in the future to pay back the debt, these are jobs whose wages must be paid by us, not by foreigners, as the foreigners *already* gave us the goods, back when we bought from them on credit, so they don't owe us any more anything. So we must, in essence, produce goods without getting paid! This is what it *means* to work off a debt, be it individual, or collective to

the British economy as a whole. In fact, this is what heavily-indebted Third World countries, labouring under debts piled up by past dictators, are always complaining about. This is why the far left thinks international debts are a new form of colonialism, designed to extract labour from the Third World without the bother of running an old-fashioned empire, and why they hate the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, which administer a lot of these debts.

7. Therefore, if **5b.** or **5c.** above are happening, our country is either **b.** gradually being sold off to foreign owners, or **c.** sinking into debt to foreigners, respectively. Either way, Britons are poorer: we own less, or we owe

make our analysis just a little bit more precise:

8. Money is the *medium* by which trade is carried out, but because money is only valuable because people can buy goods with it, we can ignore money as such and just analyse trade in terms of the flow of goods.

9. 'Goods' above means 'anything that's worth money.' It includes services. The insurance services provided by Lloyds of London are goods. Thank heavens Britain is still a world-class producer of financial services. TV programmes, tourist visits to Britain, and a lot of other odd things also count as goods. All that matters is that foreigners are willing to pay for them.

10. 'Office buildings' above actually means 'any existing asset.' It can mean shares in companies. It can mean bonds of companies. It can mean a bank in Japan buying part of a UK building society or a shopping centre. It can mean a German businessman buying a house in London. It doesn't make any difference to our analysis, so long as it used to belong to some Briton and now belongs to some foreigner.

These ten principles are inescapable. All the sophisticated complications of modern trade and modern finance cannot change them. They can only introduce a lot of wrinkles that *appear* to change them, a fact taken advantage of by free-trade ideologues who want to convince us that our trade deficit doesn't matter. But their arguments are usually quite easy to cut through if one just reduces them to the basic question analysed above:

When foreigners give us goods, what are we giving in return?

The answer is always **3a**, **3b**, or **3c**: goods we produced today, goods we produced yesterday, or goods we promise to produce tomorrow. Unless, of course, a miracle has occurred and we've managed to establish trading relations with Father Christmas at the North Pole.

And if we're not giving goods we produce today, we're either living off our past, or mortgaging our future.

Currently, every year we consume more than we produce to the tune of about 5% of GDP and we make up the difference by borrowing and selling off existing assets. We are, in other words, being decadent, and living beyond our means as a nation. We are enjoying higher consumption levels in the present, at the price of becoming indebted, and of selling off the 'family silver' of accumulated assets.

Does the Blair regime care about this problem, which is obviously a slow (and largely concealed) form of national decline? Of course not. They're quite happy to maintain short-term consumption levels, because it keeps the public pacified with a veneer of prosperity and thus keeps them in office. They're quite happy to see British assets including much of our remaining productive industry sold off to foreigners, because this helps break our national economic independence. And they simply don't care about debts that will have to be paid back years after they've left office. And if their spin-meisters in the business press and elsewhere can invent non-existent complexities, designed to make us think the problem doesn't exist, so much the better - for them, but not for us or future generations.



more. Either way, it reduces our future wealth and our future standard of living. It burdens future generations to increase the consumption of this generation.

Principles 1-7 are the basic facts. Now, if you've understood them and grasp why they have to be true, let's add three minor wrinkles that don't change the logic, but





Was Keynes A Racist?

» Alistair Harper reveals that apart from being an outstanding thinker in the field of economics, John Maynard Keynes was deeply concerned with world and domestic population, eugenics and race now regarded as the strictest taboo of our age.

» Like striptease, contemporary politics is often more interesting in what it conceals than in what it reveals.

Such is the hidden case history of John Maynard Keynes (1883 - 1946), English economist extraordinaire, whose salient contribution to 'the dismal science' was *The General Theory of Employment, Money and Interest*, published in 1936. It set the framework of what is now macro-economics. The most publicised theme of his brilliant conception was that unemployment, the economic bane of the '20s and '30s, resulted from a failure of demand for goods and services. The traditional belief, based on the laissez-faire mentality of devil-take-the-hindmost, was that demand for goods could only be increased by lowering cost prices, and that being achieved, by cutting wages. Keynes' innovative prescription, which is revered as much for its humanity as for its efficacy, was grounded on the mechanism of stimulating stagnant demand by deficit financing on the part of central government, the initiating of state enterprises, and the much greater participation of the central banks in lending to the private sector, all of which is in direct contradiction to the previously sacrosanct tenets of the balanced budget.

It is worthwhile to mention that whilst Keynes' *General Theory* did not appear till 1936, its basic propositions were at the heart of the Birmingham Proposals (1925), and the subsequent Memorandum (1929), both by Sir Oswald Mosley when he was Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in Ramsay MacDonald's Labour Government of that year.

The shoal of economic incompetents of both Left and Right, who opposed Mosley's dynamic and revolutionary proposals, in later years excused themselves of inadequacy by claiming that the *General Theory* did not appear until 1936. Unlike Mosley, who over a decade had discussed the 'Big Idea', as he called it, with Keynes, the Tory and Labour dimwits had to be led by the nose to the acceptance of



what Mosley and Keynes had perceived years before.

Keynes' career began at Cambridge, and after work with a Royal Commission enquiry into the need for the Gold Standard to apply to India, this gifted mathematics don was enlisted to the Treasury for the duration of the First World War.

In 1919 Keynes deputised for the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the Paris Peace Conference where he

argued fiercely against the majority decision to punish Germany with vast reparations. As a result of this he resigned from the Treasury to produce a scathing indictment of the Peace Terms, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*. Had the Keynesian view against crippling reparations been accepted by the Allied governments, the circumstances which produced National Socialism and Hitler might well have been avoided.

The foregoing is all very much a part of the iconography of our time, but what has been kept studiously under wraps was the fact that this outstanding economic thinker, in tandem with his highly perceptive doctrine for dealing with unemployment, money and the terms of trade, concerned himself deeply with matters of world and domestic population, eugenics and race, now regarded as the strictest taboo of our age.

These latter concerns were expanded from an original lecture delivered in 1914 to the Political Philosophy and Science Club at New College, Oxford, prophetically entitled *Is the problem of population an important and pressing one now?*

BIGOT ESTABLISHMENT

Additional material relating to Bishop Malthus, the early nineteenth-century fountain head of population studies, followed in 1924. The various sections of the work seem to have been long in their compilation, but by 1997 the completed text of *Population* had been assembled by Keynes' literary executors. There was a brief journalistic expose of the work in that year, but since then Keynes' well rounded pronouncements on population, eugenics and race have been closeted in that silence which our bigot liberal Establishment reserves for the deeply critical issues of our society and times.

However, as Aldous Huxley has pointed out, 'Facts do not cease to exist because they are ignored'.

Put bluntly, Keynes was what today is designated as a 'racist'. Nor was he alone in this standpoint. Were the

matter to be discussed at all it would have to be admitted that Charles Darwin, H.G. Wells, Francis Galton, Herbert Spencer, Alfred Marshall and his retinue of economists are all regarded with deep horror by our contemporary Establishment for their views as unblushing racials. Indeed the intellectual basis of the Socialist Labour Movement in Britain, the Fabian Society, was powered by such powerful thinkers as Sidney and Beatrice Webb. The latter, in a preface to a book on birth control and British population, made plain that the falling British birthrate was 'threatening the survival of the white race', and that immigration was no solution at all. The expression of such views today, couched in these terms, would bring the founding Socialist Baroness if not close to prosecution, at least to that ostracism suffered by the late Enoch Powell. Add to this the fact that these fundamental Socialists, the Fabians, propounded both the 'endowment of motherhood' in line with the Hitlerian practice and also the segregation of the feeble minded to prevent their reproducing their kind (*Not that either view is that of the BNP Editor*).

The 'fecundity of the East', Keynes viewed as a dreaded demographic threat to Britain and the West at large. He indicated at several critical junctures in his essay that the colonial powers, in trying to improve the lot of the masses in their charge, were continuously frustrated by relentless population growth.

This pessimistic conclusion is exactly that which many demographers, unafraid of official sanction, today perceive, the difference being that European and British colonial guidance has been replaced by

Western financial and medical aid. This has recently received expert coverage in *The Rapid Rise of Human Populations, 1750 - 2000* by Dr William Stanton. In his worldwide review of nations, sub-Saharan Africa most clearly exemplifies the inevitable and frustrating rise in population growth which follows any subventions from the West. Unless and until conditions of birth control are attached to Western aid, the contemporary experience of the fatal African population impasse will bear out Keynes' predictions.

Unlike the devoutly Christian Bishop Malthus, Keynes was agnostic, with a pragmatic *sang froid* in deliberating the problems of the developing world. As evidence of this, the following.

"In the province (Punjab) the population actually fell between 1901 and 1911, and stood in that latter year about where it had been twenty years earlier. The reason for this decline is certain. Within the decade in question, 10% of the population was swept away by plague. Without the assistance of this beneficent visitation 20 years of humane and settled government, the building of railways and an expenditure of £12 million on irrigation in the province alone, would have availed, as we can judge from experience elsewhere, very little."

He draws attention elsewhere to the fact that "before 1700 the population of China did not exceed 100 million, whereas by 1900 it stood at between 300 and 400 million." He notes with regret that "with these teeming millions the Golden Age of China had passed, 'the age of her philosophers, poets and discoveries in the arts of government and life throttled in a surfeit of population', to be overlain by its own babies".

RACIAL PRESERVATION

He is aware of the Whig-liberal attitudes of many of the political personalities of his time who had transferred from the 'primitive instinct' of racial preservation.

"They feel sympathy with the aspirations of others and very alien races...they are less convinced than the former that their own race contains within itself all that there is in the world



Keynes thought that Western Colonialism, even where suppressive, improved the lot of the native masses



most desirable; they are open to the charge of being cosmopolitan."

In a departure from the usual stance he continues: "My own sympathies are with the cosmopolitans, but it is necessary for a cosmopolitan never to forget the struggle for the survival of races and classes which the progress of civilisation has done very little to weaken."

Later, he was to assert the standpoint which has caused our current ruling class to draw a blind over so integral a part of his thinking.

"Almost any measures seem to be justified in order to protect our standard of life from injury at the hands of more prolific races. Some definite parcelling out of the world may well become necessary; and I suppose that may not improbably provoke racial wars."

Keynes was a social Darwinist in his world view. The earth was the theatre of a racial struggle for survival. 'The race struggle as to what type shall chiefly populate the world' was a

cardinal concern.

Of races themselves Keynes was stunningly frank by contemporary terms in his evaluations. Black Africans were institutionally 'savage' and he believed it to be foolish for governments to guarantee investment loans to countries where they lived. This, from the man who was a leading founder of the International Monetary Fund. In his pejorative view of the African he was followed by Field Marshall Lord Montgomery of Alamein, who was sent by PM Clement Atlee shortly after World War Two to report his opinions on sub-Saharan Africa and its inhabitants whom he, like Keynes, dubbed 'savages'.

Both Keynes and the economist Alfred Marshall, his mentor and predecessor at Cambridge, held negative views of Chinese, Indians and Jews.

In the matter of the Jews Keynes' revealed anti-Semitism can be quoted.

"Einstein was the nicest and only talented person I saw in all Berlin, except perhaps old Furstenberg...and

Kurt Singer. And he was a Jew; and so was Furstenberg. And my dear Melchior is a Jew too. Yet if I lived there I felt I might turn anti-Semite. For the poor Prussian is too slow and heavy on his legs for the other kind of Jews, the ones who are not imps but serving devils with small horns, pitchforks and oily tails. It is not agreeable to see a civilisation so under the ugly thumbs of its impure Jews who have all the money and the power and the brains."

He wrote a special preface to the German editor of *The General Theory* which recommended his concept of aggregate output to them by reason of "it being more easily adapted to the conditions of the totalitarian state".

In 1943 his anti-Semitism surfaced in his dealings with Roosevelt's government, and in particular with Harry Dexter White and F.M. Bernstein, whose machinations he viewed as evidence of 'Talmudism'.

What Keynes had to say about population and race in his day was a prologue to what current world events are now making plain. The rapid rise of world population, the unsustainability of tomorrow's earth in the face of fast-diminishing resources, the imminent clash of civilisations, the degenerate nature of an expanding underclass in the West, and the prospect of cultural and social anarchy, are all the subjects of an insidious, official concealment in contemporary society.

In casting a new light on the prophetic views of John Maynard Keynes we are helping to illuminate the evil shadows which darken the West today.

Acknowledgments

1. Titmuss K. and Titmuss R.M, 1942, p10
2. Himmelfarb, 1991
3. passim Keynes' *Papers and Collected Writings*
4. Folio 26, Keynes' Papers, King's College Library, Modern Archive
5. Folio 28, *ibid*
6. *ibid*
7. Folio 38 *ibid*
8. Keynes' *Collected Writings*, pp275-284
9. Keynes J M, *Collected Writings X*, pp383-384
10. *ibid*
11. Keynes J M, *Collected Writings X*, p610-611

Keynes thought that Black Africans were 'instinctively savage'



The Danger Facing Britain

» The danger to Britain in 1940 was apparent to those of us who were there, says Douglas Tidy, but do those younger people who do not remember those days realise that today we are in even greater danger?



» Our country has been taken over by an uncontrolled wave of immigrants from countries that do not share British values. Religious teachings have taught many of them that it is right and their duty to kill unbelievers in their medieval religion. It is not surprising that surveys conducted in Britain suggest that between 6 and 13 per cent of British Muslims - that is between 98,000 and 208,000 - admit to sympathies towards Islamic terrorists and their efforts.

Additionally, they are breeding much more rapidly than the indigenous population, and even those who have no religious axe to grind are so far removed from us that they will never integrate, but continue to exist in ghettos of their own kind. There is no intention to integrate, and multi-culturalism has become a crusade to oust the indigenous and replace them with the culture of the incomers.

Our politicians and law enforcers have fallen over backwards to encourage this. To give an example, a senior judge recently apologised to an Al Qa'eda suspect for his having been asked to attend court on his religion's 'most important day of the year'. The judge, District Judge Timothy Workman, said that he was sorry, and that if he had known a different day would have been chosen. He then asked the accused to confirm that his next scheduled hearing date was not of religious importance.

Was this a minor case of no import? No, it was that of Hassan Aswat, who was facing his extradition hearing to answer charges that he tried to set up a terrorist training camp in America. He allegedly planned to train British and American terrorists at a camp in Oregon to fight as members of the jihad in Afghanistan, and he said suicide bombers might perceive the court as an 'insult' to their religion. He said: "It is the most important day of my religion today. It is Eid. I can understand it is a technical

mistake, but for those people who did the bombs in this country, they are simple-minded. The people who do suicide bombing, the reason for it is that they have not been shown respect for their religion".

The court was told that Aswat had trained under Osama bin Laden whom he regarded as "A fine man and a good leader". Aswat was said to have openly proclaimed that the United States was a "great Satan that needs to be destroyed". His lawyer told the court: "He has not done anything against the teachings of the Koran in America or the UK." As the Koran advocates killing the infidel this gives him a pretty wide scope.

BIASED BBC

The above is typical of the absurd lengths to which the judges, politicians, and particularly the BBC have gone to further the interests of the immigrants and illegal asylum seekers at the expense of the indigenous population.

To give another example, many young doctors are unemployed because experienced immigrants have taken all the jobs. One stated that 120 job applications had been unsuccessful, despite good grades and an excellent profile.

Multi-culturalism has failed dismally and the race riots that have been blamed on right-wing parties are the result of unemployed whites ousted by immigrants (France is suffering this to a greater extent than Britain as yet, but the writing is on the wall). Nationalist parties will be blamed of course, as the mainstream parties fear that the public is at last realising that the dire warnings of Enoch Powell and others were correct. It is highly likely that desecration of Muslim burial sites is done by militant Muslim youths so as to ferment wrath against non-Muslims by accusing them of the crime.

Outsourcing and employment of cheap labour at home is the result of greed and profit-making at all costs, and the service from those who answer telephones in the far distant eastern countries, is appalling. Speaking a language that is barely understandable (allegedly English) one is quite likely to be told one does not receive electricity or gas from the company concerned, only to find after an hour's further enquiry from headquarters in the UK that of course one does so receive the service. (This actually happened to me recently).

So, the danger is that not only has multi-culturalism failed, and ghettos been formed with no intent by the immigrants to embrace the religion and mores of Britain, but we also face the danger of the European Union taking over. This will lead to our becoming a minor state in a soviet mainly under the control of Germany and France. Unless we wake up and demand that the government of the day take some action, we will have lost the fight for which so many gave their lives in 1939 to 1945.



John Bean's Nationalist Notebook

December 2005

News Commentary

The Conspiracy of Silence on Racist Murders of Whites

As I write the trial of the white sub-humans who foully murdered the young black Anthony Walker continues and still receives acres of newsprint coverage and nightly reports on television. Having stopped for lunch I nearly choked on my cheese sandwich when half-way through BBC1's lunchtime news they gave a two minute report on the sentences handed out by an Old Bailey judge on three 'Asians' (they all had Muslim names) who had kicked a white man to death. No mention of the case appeared on ITV lunchtime news, although on teletext the last item in its "News in Brief" did have 15 words on the murderers being found guilty. Its evening news had a ten second report towards the end.

If one looks at the details of this murder it was clearly a racist attack. That is the inescapable conclusion one must make when it was stated that the court heard that after the murderous attack upon Christopher Yates, a 30-year-old graduate data inputter, one of the Moslems shouted in Urdu: "We have killed the white man. That will teach an Englishman to interfere in Paki business." Yet the judge, Mr Martin Stephens, said "it was not a racist murder". However, he did sentence the three to life imprisonment, recommending that they served at least 15 years.

This racist murder, like so many where the victims are white, has been downplayed or completely ignored by the media. In fact it is so blatant that there is obviously a conspiracy in operation by the Establishment and its mouthpieces to try and hide this aspect of the "vibrant", multi-cultural society. I will borrow an expression to describe this that was used by Lee Barnes in another context when he talked of the "Mushroom Treatment": Keep us in the dark and feed us on bullshit.

The media has made great play of the fact that Anthony Walker (like Stephen Lawrence) was a "bright young student", and in Anthony Walker's case was being a young gentleman and making sure his girl friend got safely on a bus. Was there anything in your newspaper about Christopher Yates, a university graduate and a quiet and harmless young man, having just seen his girl friend off on a bus, before he had his head kicked repeatedly like a football, breaking every bone in his face, whilst being racially abused? Of course, it is just possible that as the press all had stories on the police hunt for the Somali murderers of the Bradford police woman, perhaps they feared being thought of as 'racist' if they carried yet another story of the benefits that mass immigration has brought this country.

In case there is any misunderstanding, the BNP condemns all murders, particularly racially motivated murders. But unlike the Establishment we are not selective in our condemnation. For newer readers of *Identity* the following are just a few of the racially motivated murders of whites in the past three years, which the national press and television virtually ignored:

In March last year 16-year-old Kriss Donald was

kidnapped by five Pakistani men, driven around Scotland for several hours whilst being tortured, then back to Glasgow where his eyes were gouged out and he was set alight whilst still breathing. Three of the Pakistani men were extradited from Pakistan, where they had fled, and should shortly come to trial.

Three years ago Ross Parker, 17, was walking home in Peterborough with his girlfriend when he was attacked and kicked and stabbed to death by a gang of at least eight 'Asians' (again, not Hindus or Sikhs as they all had Muslim names). In this case, the judge did say it was a racist attack.

Two years ago, Gavin Hopley of Oldham was murdered by an 'Asian' gang because he took a short cut through their territory on his way home. Sean Whyte, another teenager, of Colne, Lancs, received similar treatment from 'Asians' with Muslim names.

Lee Martin was a soldier who was on leave from service in Iraq, a fact which must have been overheard when he was having a drink in a Manchester pub. On his way home he was kicked to death by an 'Asian' gang.

On the 23rd of July this year David Henkel was racially abused by a group of Albanians in Chatham and then kicked to death.

There have, of course, been several cases where Africans or West Indians have murdered whites, but to be factual it is difficult to say whether the assailant was racially motivated or had just gone berserk. It would appear that Richard Whelan, who was stabbed six times by a chip-throwing black man on a London bus earlier this year when he tried to protect his girl friend, was a victim of a racist murder.

D.S.O. Means "Don't Sign On"

One hundred British soldiers are dead, with twice that number crippled for life, as a result of Blair taking our servicemen and women into the disaster of the Iraq conflict. Like Afghanistan, where a further 3,000 British soldiers are destined in the next few months, this was a conflict of no interest to Britain. The ultra politically correct Blair regime has rewarded our forces by putting more than 30 on trial for alleged ill-treatment of Iraqi militant prisoners, including a senior commander, Col Jorge Mendonca, who stood by his men in the Queen's Lancashire Regiment. The Colonel is quoted as saying: "Put a soldier into a helmet and armour at 58C and have Iraqis throw grenades at him, then marvel at his restraint".

In June 2004 Col Mendonca was awarded the Distinguished Service Order for outstanding bravery in Basra, and 20 of his men were also decorated. Now that our soldiers are being treated like war criminals, they are saying that the Colonel's DSO really stands for the warning message "Don't Sign On", which is reflected in the drastic decline in the number of new Army recruits.

In a bitter exchange in the House of Commons on

November 14th Tony Blair and the Attorney General, Lord Goldsmith (Blair's lifelong friend), were accused of "destroying the trust between the Armed Forces and their political and military commanders". This was said by Andrew Robathan, the shadow defence minister, who served in the Coldstream Guards and SAS. He also claimed that the Attorney General "had his fingerprints all over this case."

I would add that the trial of the seven paras, thrown out by the judge because the Iraqi witnesses were found to be lying, also had Goldsmith's greasy paws over it. And it cost the taxpayer £10 million.

Despite the Ministry of Defence offering soldiers £500 if they can recruit a mate into the Army, the recruitment crisis is such that the infantry is now 2,000 men under strength, as are 38 of the 40 battalions. The Territorial Army is suffering even worse, with more than 6,000 TA soldiers quitting in the past year because of the war in Iraq; including the revelation that some of the lightly wounded had to find their own way home to the UK to save costs!

The shortage of manpower is not new and for some time the Army has recruited Commonwealth and foreign soldiers to make up the numbers and thus becoming the "Foreign Legion" rather than the "British Army".

According to *The Times* of November 14th the foreign numbers joining have risen by nearly 3000 per cent in seven years. In recent years many regiments would not have survived without recruits from the Commonwealth, particularly from Fiji, Jamaica, South Africa and Ghana.

The BNP believes that our armed forces should not be used for political indoctrination, for implementation of political correctness theories, or for military campaigns that are not in our national interest. All future recruitment should be from those of British, old Commonwealth or kindred European stock, and salaries should be continually reviewed in order to attract the best recruits.

Humour Helps

I have written before in this column that we should all take every opportunity to write to the local - and even the national - press when the opportunity presents itself to put over the BNP case. We know that most do not see the light of day, but some do particularly where the writer has a sense of humour. The following letter, slightly abridged, from Dave Turner appeared in the *Daily Echo*, Bournemouth, on November 18th, under a full colour BNP logo.

"As a new member of the BNP I'd like to thank Cllr David Fox and Karen Adams of the Fire Brigades Union for reminding me of my exalted status as a racist thug. My transition over the last three months from disillusioned Tory to said thug has been relatively painless. I feel progress, though, has not been entirely satisfactory.

"My jackboots and red, white and blue braces have still not arrived from the warehouse, the goose-stepping manual sits unread on the bookshelf next to an unopened copy of *Mein Kampf*. I also seem to be impervious to the BNP brainwashing department as I still have no desire to shave off my full head of hair and to

have "love" and "hate" tattooed onto my knuckles. I also have no desire to beat the living daylight out of anybody, regardless of the colour of their skin or their choice of religion, although I do feel this country is not big enough to house all the world's waifs and strays and so agree that some form of immigration control is needed (must be the racist in me).

"As Cllr Fox stated that he 'abhors' the BNP and 'everything it stands for', one must assume, therefore, that he is against things such as:

- Leaving the EU, thus saving £40 billion per year and leaving behind its bureaucratic minefield.
- Deportation of all illegal immigrants.
- Abolition of student fees and a reintroduction of grammar schools.
- The restoration of capital punishment for paedophiles, terrorists and murderers as an option for judges in cases where guilt is proven beyond dispute, as by DNA evidence or being caught red-handed.
- Ending all intrusions of new developments into Green Belt areas.

"I could go on but the postie has arrived with a big parcel. I just hope it's my boots."

Tories Target Muslim Voters

On a television programme in January 1978 Margaret Thatcher spoke about the fears people then had of being 'swamped' by immigrants. Cynics said that this statement was motivated by the Tories' concern of losing votes to the National Front (before it marched itself into oblivion with the residue being split into warring factions). Possibly because of the decline of the NF, nothing was done to stop immigration and Enoch Powell said that it appeared that 'once she had spoken a chloroformed gag was clapped over her mouth'.

Today's British-born electorate knows that Labour and the Lib Dems will do nothing to halt the flood of Third World immigrants. But some foolishly believe that the new Tory Party of Cameron and Davis might put a quarter turn on the wide open tap. The following extract from the Conservative Party website last month would hardly suggest so:

"Francis Maude, Chairman of the Conservative Party, has sent his best wishes to all members of the Muslim community as they celebrate Eid-ul-Fitr the traditional celebrations of the end of the holy season of Ramadan. He said the festivities provide an opportunity for the country to enjoy with Muslims their great celebration.

"Mr Maude added: "During Ramadan we held the first meeting of the Conservative Party's new Ethnic Diversity Council. With the support of Mr Trevor Philips, Chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality, I announced the establishment of our Diversity Council at our Party Conference in October. The Chairman is Mr Mohamed Sheikh, and the Council is charged by the Party Leader with engaging more closely than ever before the Conservative Party and the ethnic communities in this country."

It should be noted that Francis Maude, having originally backed David Davis, now supports the scion of Notting Hill, David Cameron.

Speakers' Corner

PO Box 97, Newmarket, Suffolk, CB8 1WT, England. E-mail: identitymatters@yahoo.co.uk

LETTER OF THE MONTH

>> Neither Left Nor Right

When referring to the BNP our detractors invariably add the well-worn prefix "*extreme right wing*" They do this, not after careful comparison of our policies against those of other parties, but because they hope in this way to put us beyond the pale, to keep us marginalised, it being a well known fact that any form of *extremism* is anathema to your average Briton. However, a little homework on their part would reveal that in many areas of policy we are to the *left* of the three other main parties. Indeed, on issues such as employment, social security, the environment, globalisation, agriculture, transport and the economy, the BNP could be described as being *far left* of both Labour and the Lib-Dems.

Interestingly, Russians today refer to the Communists as *right wing*, but in doing so they are simply following the West in using it as a pejorative term.

All the above points to the fact that the old right/left labels are no longer useful in gauging political stances on particular issues, as the boundaries have become somewhat blurred. Furthermore, the *extreme right wing* mantra is becoming a little tedious, indeed childish, in the way it is used to stifle adult debate on what are desperately important issues.

Roberta Woods
Eltham

>> DNA and Racial Differences

I was most impressed by John Bean's well structured "outing" of racial differences contained in the scientific as opposed to the political determination of the human genome.

Prior to the revelation of the double helix and the monumental advance pioneered by Profs. Crick and Watson, the left had obdurately paraded "culture" over biology in explaining the difference between human individuals and groups. This specious doctrine was led by anthropologists Franz Boas and Israel Ehrenberg (Ashley Montagu) and they continued to dominate sociology, anthropology and the human sciences until the pre-eminence of the biological and genetic component in the late 60s could no longer be ignored. The realisation was a parallel in science to the collapse of the Berlin Wall.

A rearguard action by the Left, however, is still being conducted by a

diminishing web of ideologues, led by Prof. Richard Lewontin whose sly misinterpretation of the 15% variation found within different races in a mix is employed to try and disprove the existence of races and indeed of individual differences.

The critical importance of the almost daily revelations in human genetics and the rapidly shifting edge of discovery leaves us in no doubt that the political distortions of the left wing ideologues will shortly be swept aside by further scientific discovery.

John Bean's article is of considerable educational importance and readers of *Identity* should be aware of the fast flowing action in this foremost field of science.

David Fordyce
West Aberdeenshire

>> Christianity and Islam

Whilst Pope John Paul II constantly sought tolerance between the great

faiths, he did not believe we should refrain from asking fundamental questions. An example of this was given in *The Universe* 6.11.05, by David Alton, who wrote: "In the 1990s John Paul II said: 'Did you ever read the Qur'an?' I recommend it. What the Qur'an teaches people is aggression; and what we (Christians) teach our people is peace...Christianity aspires to peace and love.

Islam is a religion that attacks. If you start teaching aggression to the whole community, you end up pandering to the negative elements in everyone.' "

Peter Bloor
Birmingham

>> Nationalist Attitudes In France

I always enjoy reading your well-researched *Nationalist Notebook* and found your comment on 'white flight' from the UK of particular interest, being one myself. Excessive Third World immigration was a significant factor but not my only reason; a view probably held by most other 'white flighters'.

However, here in France - particularly since the recent Muslim riots - we do not underestimate the growing menace of immigration into Europe, in fact awareness of the problem is ahead of that in the UK, despite the 7/7 bombings. So, we are able to work from a higher base than in the UK. For example, around 18% of French electors vote for the Front National - more in the south where there are more AaAs (Arab and Africans) (*A post-riots poll in France put support for the FN at 24% - Editor*). The rise of nationalist politics elsewhere in continental Europe confirms this awareness is widespread.

There are some unique disadvantages in the UK for British nationalists. The 'first-past-the-post' voting system could preclude the

BNP from attaining political power. There has to be a change to PR (proportional representation) as there are too many ways to thwart voting representation with the present system. Also, there is an institutional prejudice against English nationalism, although not against Welsh, Irish or Scottish nationalism.

Then there is political correctness! This malign polemic blights the Anglo-Saxon community world-wide but seems at its worst in the UK. Whereas here in France I cannot remember an instance of it in the last two years.

For example, until now, there is almost a complete absence of ethnics on the TV as presenters or celebrities - none at all on children's TV. There are no burqas, hijabs, Sikh turbans, Jewish caps or other ethnic dress in French State schools. There are no loony rules about changing Christian values to accommodate multi-cultural sensitivities, because there is only French culture! Additionally, all official documents, advice, regulations, etc are in the French language only.

John Flynn
E-mail

>> If It Happened In A Muslim Land

Picture a situation in Pakistan, Egypt, Indonesia or Saudi Arabia whereby a group of mainly white young European and Christian dissident immigrants (not that such immigrants would be allowed or tolerated in the first place) start demonstrating and setting light to cars and buildings and attacking the nationals of that country. The police would not merely arrest them and put them in detention. Those who were not shot on sight would be flogged and probably be whipped and/or publicly beheaded without the semblance of a trial!

Yet the mainly Arab/Moslem rioters in hundreds of towns and cities in France (and some in Denmark and Belgium) expect lenient treatment and to be favoured for jobs when unemployment is already high. Is it reasonable to expect any employer to prefer an arrogant, aggressive Arab/Muslim over a European with at least as

good, if not better, qualifications and a better attitude to the post?

Citizens of Britain beware. Only 22 miles separates us from France. Will we now follow France and experience riots here as we did in Bradford and in Luton but on a *much* bigger scale and fueled even further by religion?

D.M.Woolmer
St.Albans

>> Selective Concern Over Race Murders

Going back a few months when there was the racist murder of Kriss Donald by Muslims in Glasgow, I wrote to several national newspapers pointing out that if Kriss Donald had been Asian or Black and his murderers white, the media and the anti-British left would have been in full cry, with candlelit vigils etc.

Well surprise, surprise if after the apparent racist murder of the Black student Anthony Walker in Liverpool there was not a candlelit vigil at the spot where he died, a full service in the cathedral and acres of media publicity before and since the trial of his murderers.

The difference, of course, is that Anthony was Black, hence the mass public grieving organised by the Pol Pot left who ignore the numerous white racist victims such as Kriss. Britain is now a nation where the lives of the indigenous British people mean nothing to the anti-white multi-cultural fanatics in the Establishment who now rule this country.

John McCaffrey
Sunderland

>> What Do Conservatives Conserve?

I was interested to read your October editorial on how some readers have been labouring under the illusion that "salvation could come from the Conservative Party". You might be interested to read this anecdote.

Some years ago I worked for British Rail as a footplate man. We often used to get into discussions over politics and I always remember an "old-hand" driver who said: "I've never understood why they call themselves 'Conservatives'. What

exactly are they 'conserving'?" Perhaps they were conserving their own self-interests and, those in business, their profits? They are certainly not conserving the heritage and traditional structures that made this a great country. Anything is fair game; anything is expendable for big business.

I also recall getting into scrapes with one or two Marxist Union activists flying under Labour colours. I soon recognised that I was not an instinctive Marxist, despite being young and naive. One chap in particular could not engage in discussion and resorted to his fists. I soon realised that Marxists don't like free thinkers!

John Roberts
Wakefield

>> Aid For The Bomb

In early November our television screens were full of horrible images of devastation from the Pakistan earthquake. I can sympathise with the victims who have lost so much and applaud the specialist rescue teams from around the world who did so much to save lives. I am not so enthusiastic, however, about the appeal for long term aid to help rebuild the affected areas.

The UN recently complained that they had received only half of the \$530 million asked for to help Pakistan. So far I have not heard a single voice ask the most relevant question regarding this, namely why can't the Pakistani Government afford to help its own people rebuild their homes but can well afford the staggering cost of developing nuclear weapons?

The total cost of this nuclear programme since its inception has been variously estimated at anywhere between \$6 billion and \$25 billion.

We should all be asking Pakistan what they have done with their own cash, doubtless there are a lot of Pakistanis amidst the ruins asking the same question. I for one have no intention of subsidising the Islamic bomb.

L.Watts
Lisse, Holland



A Practical Guide to Speaking

» *Emma Chamberlain is an actress and a public speaking tutor. She has recently agreed to lead a workshop on public speaking for BNP members.*

» A great speech can be destroyed by poor presentation, just as a poor speech can be made brilliant by the delivery of the speaker. It is a common oversight to think that, once you have penned your speech, the work is finished and you are ready to face your audience. Rehearsal is of the greatest importance and a speaker should take as much time in practicing a speech as they do in writing the words. Remember, the listener can be enthralled and captivated by what is being said and how it is delivered, just as easily as they can be turned off and bored.

With this in mind, it is principal to consider something that is too often overlooked, yet crucial in setting the tone and quality of the speech: The importance of beginning.

BEGINNINGS

When we engage in a conversation with someone, unless we are talking to a person who is of significant importance, we rarely consider how to start speaking. However, when addressing a room full of expectant listeners it is a very different matter. The first minutes of your speech are imperative because, just like during the first meeting with an important stranger, ideas are shaped and opinions formed about you. If you are confident about what you are saying and how you are conveying this, then the initial part of your speech shouldn't be seen daunting, but rather as setting a certain standard that will continue throughout. Quite simply, start as you mean to go on.

Your manner must seem assured and confident and the way that you take the stage at the very outset should reflect this. Try not to cough or clear your throat the instant the audience's attention is focussed on you - it will inadvertently give off the impression of uncertainty or nerves. This, of course, is easier said than done, but the 'frog in the throat' is so often psychological when starting a

speech and forgotten about as soon as the speaker begins.

You should aim to grab the attention of the audience from the word go, that way they will be far more likely to stay alert throughout. Don't make the mistake of starting off with a weak beginning; you risk losing the attention of the listeners right away and never getting that back.

If you suffer from nerves, then you should prepare yourself thoroughly beforehand. Fear of the unknown is, perhaps, one of the biggest reasons for alarm when making a speech and so, by removing this very aspect, the speaker can enter the room in a composed and confident manner.

One of the most obvious causes for concern when speaking in public is that there might be someone in the audience who knows more than you. It is crucial to lead your audience and therefore show your authority from the start. If you know that there is someone in the group who is of influence, then your aim must be to impress, not dismay. By taking control at the very beginning, intimidation shouldn't be an issue.

Another cause for nerves is the fear of drying up. If this happens, then the easiest thing to do is swiftly consult your notes. As long as you remember the concept or idea that you were about to cover and are knowledgeable of your subject, there shouldn't be any reason why you can't resume the speech as quickly as possible. Remember, your audience have absolutely no idea of what you were about to say and are waiting to be led. Your drying up will only be apparent to them if you begin to ramble or apologise. Always have a glass of water near by and don't be frightened to take the time to drink from it.

Shaking is also a very common problem. Make sure that your speech or notes are on cards as opposed to paper. Not only are these neater and less conspicuous,

but it will be harder for the audience to see if you are shaking. Alternatively, a lectern or desk will give you something solid to hold on to.

Most importantly, if you are confident about your beginning the way to eradicate your nerves goes hand in hand with this. Starting your speech on the right foot and engaging the audience's attention from the very start, will put you in particularly good stead and wipe out many of your previous worries.

CLARITY AND PRESENTATION

It has been proven that when a voice-trained person delivers information, the audience retains 83 per cent of the content, opposed to when an untrained individual delivers the same information, the audience retains only 45 per cent. Don't be put off by such statistics, but instead use certain techniques in order to gain the confidence and vocal command of a professional speaker.

Your voice is the most important instrument that you have when giving a speech, regardless of whether you are using visuals as well. The sound of Winston Churchill's voice, for example, provokes feelings of pride and victory in the hearts of every true Briton, and this serves as a very clear example of just how important the voice is. Do not underestimate your own.

Primarily, the speaker must be able to control their breathing and project their voice without finding themselves out of breath. When taking a breath, you should make sure that more air is inhaled into your lungs than the amount used when having a normal conversation. This will allow you to project your voice without shouting or running out of breath half-way through a sentence. Breathing more deeply will also help you slow down your normal rate of speech and pronounce your words clearly.

There is absolutely no reason for you to change your accent in any way, but simply take a little more care in the pronunciation of some words, especially if you are nervous. Also, do not let the ends of words or sentences trail off; this can come across as if the speaker has a lack of belief in what they are saying. Each word must seem assured, so speak up and never mumble.

The volume of your voice is incredibly important. Everybody has the capacity to make their voices louder or softer and this is an interesting tool when speaking in public. Varying volume will keep your audience interested in what you are saying and give your delivery more 'vocal colour'.

Pausing is another useful tool and one that should not be undermined. It can be used to let a startling fact sink in or to give the audience time to absorb exactly what you have said. Never be afraid to use a moment of silence during your speech as it will add impact as well as rhythm and emphasis to the presentation.

Gesture is a further significant device in speech-making and can help illustrate a point. Using your hands freely to compliment what you are saying shows a naturalness and self-assured confidence which will give your listener faith in you and your speech. Make sure, however, that you don't overdo your gestures, or it will distract attention and the audience will take more notice of your hands than of what you actually have to say.

Remember, when you practice your speech, practice your gestures too.

Eye-contact with the audience is an important part of your presentation and this should be established almost immediately. Never look above the heads of your listeners or to the side of them. By looking directly at their audience the speaker instantly creates familiarity and trust. This is extremely valuable if you want people to hang on your every word and have true belief in what you are saying.

It is imperative that, before you deliver your speech, you rehearse exactly what you are going to say. A balance should be found between the correctness of written English and abbreviations and/or informalities. For example, if, in usual conversation, you use 'gonna' and 'wanna', you should take time to make sure that, when you deliver your speech, these become 'going to' and 'want to'. However, it is important not to stick too closely to the written word or your voice might become stilted and colourless. Never read a speech out word for word, however articulate this might seem, your lack of eye-contact and gestures will make the delivery stiff and impersonal.

The speaker should strive to 'um' and 'er' as little as possible. A handy exercise when practicing speaking in public, is to give yourself a subject and see if you can talk for a minute on this without uttering one single 'um' or 'er'. The most useful way to banish any hesitation when speaking, is to form the words in your head before they come out of your mouth - you therefore know exactly what you are saying and your delivery will be fluent. Of course, if you have practiced your speech enough this shouldn't be an issue, as you will be well aware of what comes next.

HOW TO END

Finishing big is as important as beginning with impact. You must pull the group together and reinforce the main message of your speech. If you have used cue cards throughout, then try to learn your ending off by heart - this will add naturalness to what you are saying and also increase the impact.

Don't be frightened to use drama or emotion to strengthen your concluding point, it will bring your intentions clearly home to the listener and add even more force to the argument or point that you have been putting across. One of the main aims of the speaker is to make sure that the audience go away, not only having fully understood what has been said, but also believing in it. At this point, your audience must have faith in you and need to be filled with certainty and assurance. The use of drama will establish your seriousness and also wake up anybody whose attention might have wandered. Never shy away from coming across as a strong, assertive individual, but make sure that, on no account, you seem arrogant. Sincerity is of the utmost importance.

If in doubt of any aspect of delivering a speech, then it is always a good idea to study someone whom you particularly admire and take parts of their presentation and style and make them your own. Above all, have faith in yourself, your speech and your ultimate goals and remember, if you can convey half of your passion to the audience by the end, then you have achieved what you set out to do.



BOOK REVIEW: The Sword of the Prophet

» Reviewed by Sadie Graham

» This book is without doubt the most controversial critique of Islam published to date. It blows open the concealed cover on political Islam and exposes its fundamentalist mission. It demonstrates how many of the adherents of Islam have views that are just incompatible with modern western ideals and how this is resulting in feelings of unrest. This unrest was strengthened when terrorists decided to fly two planes into the Twin Towers and to blow-up innocent people in the London 7/7 attacks. Yet we are told by their and our political leaders (BNP Chairman exempt) that Islam is a peace-loving, tolerant religion. However based on the evidence that we see with our own eyes, is this really the picture that they present of themselves?


Of course there is always the exception, and there are many Muslims who are critical of fundamentalist Islam. Yet we see first hand what is happening on our own streets in Britain, for example with the celebrations of the 7/7 atrocities by Muslims in London and Bradford. A religion that in some Muslim states still beheads apostates, stones women to death and chops-off hands & feet from petty thieves (ok, I admit to agreeing with the last of these).

As the author of this book says 'These acts seem more indicative of a seriously dysfunctional society than the characteristics of a benevolent and merciful religion.' (P3) Although who's the most dysfunctional? The fundamentalists or us for allowing them into Britain?

The book starts from the religion's beginnings and discusses Muhammad, the founder of Islam. It raises important aspects about the growth of Islam and its teachings, including seemingly contradictory views that feature in the Koran. Radical Islam is not a twentieth century phenomenon, it is almost three centuries old that has veered very little from its original model. Marxist-Fascist and Islamist projects have a common desire for other people's property and control over other people's lives. Although now that the global threat of Marxist-Fascism and Communism is dead, radical Islam is the current blueprint for conquest.

Islam created, and remains defined by, jihad. In its relation to the rest of the world, jihad is its most important concept. Jihad or *Holy War* is very real and this war is in progress. It is difficult to understand and comprehend exactly what it is about Westerners which is so hated by Fanatical Islamists. We can understand that the gum-chewing, obese, greedy, hamburger-scoffing, celebrity obsessed, Capitalist image of the West is something we shouldn't be proud of. Although this image has largely been created by Hollywood, it incorporates some serious and important truths. The West is quickly becoming secular. We have no endorsed national religion anymore and are more at home bowing before the powerful religion of multi-culturalism than actually practicing anything resembling Christian or Pagan traditions.

THE POLITICALLY INCORRECT GUIDE TO ISLAM



The simple fact is that the power of radical Islam is not held within its religious laws and codes but imposed through its political and cultural doctrines that seek to conquer our territory and souls. These are the tenets that seek the annihilation of our freedom and civilisation. The power of Islamist ideology is within the communities that we live in, we allow it more power every time we close down another church, build a new mosque or another white girl is groomed for prostitution on the streets of Keighley, Blackburn or Rotherham.

Islam is the fastest growing faith in the Western world with 20 million inhabitants of the EU as self-avowed Muslims. If current trends continue, by 2020, Muslims will account for ten percent of the overall population of Europe. This is conquest by demographic rather than military means. Islam is a growing power that we should be very wary of and therefore seek all knowledge of its intentions.

If, after reading this, you are wondering what drives people to martyr themselves for Islam then read this book! If you want to know why democracy and the rule of law do not exist in the majority of Muslim states then read this book! If you are also puzzling over why in the past 20 years, over 2 million people have died in conflicts that involve Muslim countries then this book should definitely be at the top of your Christmas list!

£16 inc p&p. See opposite for details and for more Excalibur merchandise



Excalibur

www.excaliburheritage.com - 07074 532 267

Please make all cheques payable to "Excalibur" and send to PO Box 116, Leeds, LS27 9WW. When ordering please clearly specify which item you require and the size.

December 2005

Merchandise

Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Magic

Magic is something special, something unauthorised; an alternative perhaps; even a deliberate cultivation of dark, evil powers. But for the Anglo-Saxon age, the neat division between mainstream and occult, rational and superstitious, Christian and pagan is not always easy to discern. To maintain its authority (or its monopoly?) the Church drew a formal line and outlawed a range of dubious practices (like divination, spells, folk healing) while at the same time conducting very similar rituals itself, and may even have adapted legends of elves to serve in a Christian explanation of disease as a battle between good and evil, between Church and demons; in other cases powerful ancestors came to serve as saints. In pursuit of a better understanding of Anglo-Saxon magic, a wide range of topics and texts are examined in this book, challenging (constructively, it is hoped) our stereotyped images of the past and its beliefs. Texts are printed in their original language (e.g. Old English, Icelandic, Latin) with New English translations. Contents include:- twenty charms; the English, Icelandic and Norwegian rune poems; texts on dreams, weather signs, unlucky days, the solar system; and much more. Published May 2003.

£18 (inc p&p)

Beowulf - Text & Translation



The verse in which the story unfolds is, by common consent, the finest writing surviving in Old English, a text that all students of the language and many general readers will want to tackle in the original form. To aid understanding of the Old English, a literal word-by-word translation is printed opposite the edited Old English text and provides a practical key to this Anglo-Saxon masterpiece. Published in 2003.

£11 (inc. p&p)

BNP Calendar 2006

Plan your nationalist year with the 2006 BNP calendar! This is the first ever professionally produced calendar of the British National Party. It contains a wide range of great BNP photographs and a whole host of dates of relevance to our party and our people as a whole. These large calendars are limited edition; only 500 have been produced and will be sold strictly on a first come first served basis.

£8.99 (inc. p&p)





Court Case Appeal

The fight for freedom costs money! The Leeds Free Speech Two trial starts on January 16th and to run for at least three hectic weeks. Although Nick Griffin and Mark Collett are receiving legal aid for their lawyers' costs the case will still cost thousands of pounds to fight properly. Extra publicity material, security, banners and placards, publicity stunts, witness expenses and many other essentials all have to be paid for.

Nick and Mark are fighting not just for their own liberty, but for the freedom of every BNP member and every native Briton. Please do whatever you can to help ensure that the British National Party is not short of the financial ammunition it needs to turn this trial into a national *cause celebre*.

Yes! I want to help the British National Party keep up its campaign for free speech.

☐ **£10**

☐ **£25**

☐ **£1000**

☐ **£50**

☐ **£100**

☐ **Other:**

Name:

Address:

Please send to: The Secretary, PO Box 907, Hull, HU6 9WY

Please send an SAE if you require an acknowledgement for sums of £25 or less

Subscribe To Identity

The following rates are for 6 or 12 issues respectively (please tick box as applicable):

British Isles £15 ☐ £30 ☐

Overseas surface mail £16.50 ☐ £33 ☐

Unsealed air mail Europe £17.50 ☐ £35 ☐

Unsealed air mail Middle East, North and South America £24 ☐ £48 ☐

Unsealed air mail Australasia, Far East £25 ☐ £50 ☐

Please Note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If you are paying in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required with cheques and money orders and £2.50 with banknotes.

Name

Address

Postcode

Telephone

E-mail

All cheques etc should be made payable to 'British National Party' or 'British Heritage' and sent to PO Box 87, Ossett, Wakefield, WF5 8WN. You can subscribe online at www.bnp.org.uk. Photocopies can be used.

Identity Bulk Order Rates

5 - £9.25; 10 - £15; 15 - £20; 20 - £24.50; 25 - £29; 30 - £34; 40 - £43.50; 50 - £52.50; 60 - £62.50; 70 - £71.50; 80 - £81; 90 - £90.50; 100 - £100

Postage - £1.05 for 5; £1.94 for 10; £4.05 for 15 - 20; £4.34 for 25 - 30; £5.19 for 40 - 50

Trade Deficit Matters

...erable problem, judging by even the Establishment
...dacre says unfortunately it is a subject liable to
...gnore it, simply because most people don't quite
...ough they intuitively sense that something is wrong
...ough the basics with care, because once one truly
...problem and become immune to the deliberately
...who want to cover it up. Just follow the logic below,

the British economy as a whole. In fact, this is what heavily-indebted Third World countries, labouring under debts piled up by past dictators, are always complaining about. This is why the far left thinks international debts are a new form of colonialism, designed to extract labour from the Third World without the bother of running an old-fashioned empire, and why they hate the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, which administer a lot of these debts.

7. Therefore, if **5b.** or **5c.** above are happening, our country is either **b.** gradually being sold off to foreign owners, or **c.** sinking into debt to foreigners, respectively. Either way, Britons are poorer: we own less, or we owe



we could afford to do so because the foreign sale brought in money to pay the workers.

But in case **b**, the office building has *already been* produced, so no jobs *today* are created by selling it to some foreigner. The foreigner is just as happy to become the proud owner of a £100,000,000 office building in London as he would have been to get £100,000,000 in Rolls Royces, but we don't get any jobs out of it. In essence, we're cannibalising our past production of goods to pay for present consumption. We're living off our past.

And in case **c**, while it is true that jobs *will* have to be created to produce goods at some time in the future to pay back the debt, these are jobs whose wages must be paid by us, not by foreigners, as the foreigners *already* gave us the goods, back when we bought from them on credit, so they don't owe us any more anything. So we must, in essence, produce goods without getting paid! This is what it *means* to work off a debt, be it individual, or collective to

more. Either way, it reduces our future wealth and our future standard of living. It burdens future generations to increase the consumption of this generation.

Principles 1-7 are the basic facts. Now, if you've understood them and grasp why they have to be true, let's add three minor wrinkles that don't change the logic, but

